



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/509,507  | 12/22/2004  | Igor Stagljär        | 3032-101            | 6720             |
| 46002 7590 04/30/2008<br>JOYCE VON NATZMER<br>PIQUIGNOT + MYERS LLC<br>200 Madison Avenue<br>Suite 1901<br>New York, NY 10016 |             |                      |                     |                  |
| EXAMINER  |             |                      |                     |                  |
| JOIKE, MICHELE K  |             |                      |                     |                  |
| ART UNIT  |             | PAPER NUMBER         |                     |                  |
| 1636  |             |                      |                     |                  |
| MAIL DATE   |             | DELIVERY MODE        |                     |                  |
| 04/30/2008  |             | PAPER                |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/509,507

**Applicant(s)**

STAGLJAR ET AL.

**Examiner**

MICHELE K. JOIKE

**Art Unit**

1636

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MICHELE K. JOIKE.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Joyce von Natzmer.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 24 April 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant

2) ☐ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes

e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 48 and 66.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The reasons for non-entry of the amendment to claim 66 was discussed. Specifically, the Examiner explained that claim 66 was now a product by process claim instead of a method claim, which did not place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing the issues.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Michele K Joike, Ph.D./

Examiner, Art Unit 1636

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required